

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>LISA FARVER,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:10-CV-1927</b>
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	
	:	
v.	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
	:	
<b>COVENTRY HEALTH CARE, INC.,</b>	:	
<b>Defendant</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 10th day of April, 2012, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Mildred E. Methvin (Doc. 28), recommending that defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 16) be denied, and, following an independent review of the record and noting that defendant filed objections to the report on March 16, 2012 (Doc. 29), and the Court finding Judge Methvin's analysis to be thorough and well-reasoned, and the court finding defendant's objections<sup>1</sup> to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Methvin's report (Doc. 28), it is hereby ORDERED that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at \*3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at \*6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Methvin (Doc. 28) are ADOPTED.
2. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 16) is DENIED.
3. A revised pretrial/trial schedule shall issue by separate order.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge